#### REMARKS

In the most recent Office Action, claims 1-3, 6 and 8-23 were pending. Claims 2, 6, 11 and 14 are withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 3, 8-10, 13, 15-19 and 21-23 are rejected. Claims 12 and 20 are objected to.

In response, claims 2, 6 and 8-23 are canceled. Claim 1 is amended. Accordingly, claims 1 and 3 are pending in the application. No new matter is added.

Applicant thanks Examiner for the thorough search and consideration of the invention recited in the pending claims, and responds to the comments in the Office Action as follows.

### Election/Restrictions

The Office Action states that the election of species III in the reply filed 26 August, 2005 is acknowledged. The Office Action also states that Applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement. The Office Action states that the election has been treated as an election without traverse.

Applicant has canceled claims 2, 6, 11 and 14 from the application without prejudice.

## Claim Objections

The Office Action states that claims 17 and 19-23 are objected to for informalities including insufficient antecedent basis. Applicant has canceled claims 17 and 19-23, thereby rendering the objection moot.

# Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action states that claims 8-10, 13, 17-19 and 21 are rejected under U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese patent document 2001-61514 (JP '514). In particular, the Office Action states that JP '514 teaches each and every element recited in the rejected claims.

Claims 8-10, 13, 17-19 and 21 are canceled from the application, thereby rendering the rejection of those claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) moot.

The Office Action states that claims 1, 3, 8-10, 13, 15-19 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent Document 408-84610 (JP '610). In particular, the Office Action states that JP '610 teaches each and every element recited in the rejected claims.

Claims 8-10, 13, 15-19 and 21-23 are canceled from the application, thereby rendering moot the rejection of those claims

as anticipated by JP '610 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). With respect to the remaining claims, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The disclosure of JP '610 apparently shows a buckle that is uncoupled by further inserting a plug into a socket to activate a disengagement mechanism. The disengagement mechanism provides for a block that displaces a pawl so that the latch mechanism is disengaged. The disengagement mechanism shown in JP '610 apparently operates based on internal mechanisms that permit the block to slide under the pawl to displace the pawl. Accordingly, the disengagement mechanism appears to be on the plug itself.

Claims 1 and 3 of the present invention call for the disengagement device to be located on the socket to disengage the latch and the catch when the disengagement device is actuated.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 3 recite limitations that are not taught in the cited prior art reference of JP '610.

### Conclusion

Applicant has canceled claims in the application to simplify the issues under consideration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116.

Accordingly, Applicant believes that the present response raises

no new issues that may require further search or consideration and respectfully requests entry of the response.

In view of the above amendments and discussion, Applicant respectfully submits that the present Application is now in condition for allowance, and earnestly solicits notice to that effect. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned counsel at the number provided below to discuss any matter that may expedite a disposition of the case.

Respectfully submitted,
PAUL GIAMPAVOLO

By: Burst | Nemmedy Brendan J. Kennedy Registration No. 41,890 Attorney for Applicant(s)

WEINGARTEN, SCHURGIN,
GAGNEBIN & LEBOVICI LLP
Ten Post Office Square
Boston, MA 02109
Telephone: (617) 542-2290
Telecopier: (617) 451-0313

BJK/dmc

336488.1